

REMARKS

Applicant thanks Examiner Ingberg for the Interview held on November 18, 2004 for indicating that the proposed amendment to claim 1 would overcome the art of record.

Claims 1-17 are pending. By this amendment, claims 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 16, and 17 are amended. No new matter is introduced. Support for the amendments may be found at least in Figure 3 and at page 6, lines 5-6, page 6, lines 16-18, page 7, lines 11-12, and page 7, lines 15-18 of the specification. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims in view of the above amendments and the remarks that follow are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

On page 2 the Office Action rejects claims 1-8 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §101. Independent claims 1 and 17 have been amended according to the Examiner's suggestions. Withdrawal of the claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

On page 3 the Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 10, 12-15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent 6,185,729 to Wantanabe (hereafter Wantanabe). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 2, the Office Action asserts that Wantanabe discloses the step of "determining whether the character string being tested is defined by a message catalogue key, whereby the character string being tested is internationalized if it contains the message catalogue key" at column 4, line 60 – end of page and in Figure 4.

Wantanabe is directed to a development suite for developing and testing internationalized software. The development suite includes, in addition to an ASCII English locale, a multibyte English locale. Specifically, Wantanabe discloses at column 4, lines 60 – 67:

Further, enhancements to the software and incorporation of engineering change orders can be developed and tested in both the USASCII locale and in a multi-byte English locale, thus identifying and correcting at an early stage those software bugs at much less cost.

The invention is directed to a method of testing internationalized software, by binding internationalized software to be tested to a multibyte locale created for a single byte language. In it's simplest form, this is done by creating a mapping between multibyte binary words and characters of said single byte language; and providing for conversion of representations of characters of said single byte language into corresponding multibyte binary words specified by said mapping.

Figure 4 of Wantanabe illustrates life cycle development and testing of an internationalized computer program developed in the United States. Contrary to the Office Action's assertion, the recited passages does not define or use message catalogue keys, let alone determining whether the character string being tested is defined by a message catalogue key. Nowhere does Wantanabe disclose or suggest this determination step.

In contrast to Wantanabe, amended claim 1 recites "determining whether a character string being tested is defined by a message catalogue key." The message catalogue key is defined in the specification at page 7, lines 11-12 and page 6, line 5, as well as in amended claim 1: "wherein the message catalogue key is a variable that references a particular character string value in a message catalogue, the message catalogue containing character strings expressed in a particular language." As noted above, this feature is not disclosed or suggested by Wantanabe.

Moreover, Wantanabe does not disclose or suggest the following specific steps recited in amended claim 1: "if the character string is defined by a message catalogue key, retrieving a value of the character string from an appropriate message catalogue; determining whether a mangle switch value is true, wherein the mangle switch value is true if the command contains a test switch; and if the mangle switch value is true, modifying a display of the character string being tested using a mangle algorithm" (emphasis added). As recited at page 8, lines 3-15 of the present application, the mangle algorithm modifies the display of the character string by switching the case of each letter in the character string. "By thus modifying the properly internationalized character string, any character strings that are not internationalized, meaning that the character string is not defined by a message key, will clearly stand out to the program developer. The program developer can then go into the program 32 code and insure that the incorrectly hard-coded character string if defined by a message key." (See page 8, lines 10-15 of the present application). None of the references disclose or suggest using a mangled algorithm for such a reason. Therefore, amended claim 1 is allowable over Wantanabe.

Claims 2 and 4-7 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 1 and for the additional features they recite.

Regarding claim 9, for the same reason as noted above with respect to claim 1, Wantanabe does not disclose or suggest "a module to determine whether a character string being tested is defined by a message catalogue key, wherein the message catalogue key is a variable that references a particular character string value in a message catalogue, the message catalogue containing character strings expressed in a particular language; a module

to retrieve a value of the character string from an appropriate message catalogue if the character string is defined by a message catalogue key; a module to determine whether a mangle switch value is true, wherein the mangle switch value is true if the command contains a test switch; and a module to modify the character string being tested using a mangle algorithm if the mangle switch value is true,” as recited in amended claim 9. Accordingly, amended claim 9 is patentable.

Claims 10 and 12-15 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 9 and for the additional features they recite.

Regarding claim 17, for the same reason as noted above with respect to claim 1, Wantanabe does not disclose or suggest “a module to determine whether a character string being tested is defined by a message catalogue key, wherein the message catalogue key is a variable that references a particular character string value in a message catalogue, the message catalogue containing character strings expressed in a particular language; a module to retrieve a value of the character string from an appropriate message catalogue if the character string is defined by a message catalogue key; a module to determine whether a mangle switch value is true, wherein the mangle switch value is true if the command contains a test switch; and a module to modify the character string being tested using a mangle algorithm if the mangle switch value is true,” as recited in amended claim 17. Accordingly, amended claim 17 is patentable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 10, 12-15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

On page 5 the Office Action rejects claims 3 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Wantanabe in view of U.S. Patent 5,778,356 to Heiny (hereafter Heiny). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Heiny is directed to a dynamically selectable language display system for object oriented database management systems. However, Heiny does not cure Wantanabe’s defect and does not disclose or suggest “determining whether a character string being tested is defined by a message catalogue key, wherein the message catalogue key is a variable that references a particular character string value in a message catalogue, the message catalogue containing character strings expressed in a particular language; if the character string is defined by a message catalogue key, retrieving a value of the character string from an appropriate message catalogue; determining whether a mangle switch value is true, wherein the mangle switch value is true if the command contains a test switch; and modifying the character string being tested using a mangle algorithm,” as recited in amended claim 1.

Amended claim 9 recites similar features. Therefore, amended claims 1 and 9 are allowable over Wantanabe and Heiny.

Claims 3 and 11 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claims 1 and 9, respectively, and for the additional features they recite. For example, none of the references disclose or suggest “displaying to the tester the character string being tested as hard-coded when the character string being tested is not defined by the message catalogue key,” as recited in amended claim 3 (emphasis added). Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) is respectfully requested.

On page 6 the Office Action rejects claims 8 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Wantanabe in view of IBM Graphical Locale Builder. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

IBM Graphical Locale Builder does not cure Wantanabe’s defect and does not disclose or suggest all of the limitations of amended claims 1 and 9. Therefore, amended claims 1 and 9 are allowable over Wantanabe and IBM Graphical Local Builder.

Claims 8 and 16 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claims 1 and 9, respectively, and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt examination and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desired in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant’s undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 2, 2004


Kelly T. Lee
Registration No. 47,743
Andrews Kurth LLP
1701 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006
Tel. (202) 662-2736
Fax (202) 662-2739